

# A STUDY ON THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF MAN 2 MODEL PEKANBARU IN COMPREHENDING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT

Muthia Abrar, Eliwarti, Fakhri Ras.  
muthia.abrar@gmail.com, elieliwarti@gmail.com, fakhrras@yahoo.com.  
Contact: +6285264692766

*Student of English Study Program  
Language and Arts Department  
Faculty of Teachers Training and Education  
Universitas Riau*

**Abstract:** *This descriptive research aims to find out the ability of the second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in comprehending hortatory exposition text. The population of this research were the second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in academic year 2016/2017. The number of sample were 50 students which were chosen by using random sampling technique. The data were collected using reading comprehension test in multiple choice types by giving 5 hortatory exposition texts with 40 multiple choice items. The results of the data analysis showed that the mean score of the students' ability in comprehending hortatory eksposition text is as big as 65.55. It can be concluded that the ability of the second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in comprehending hortatory eksposition text is categorized good. Based on the result of the students' ability in each of reading comprehension component, the lowest component of reading comprehension for the students was finding meaning of certain words (54.8) and the highest one was finding factual information (82). This result suggests that the students need to learn more in comprehending hortatory exposition text. Even though the mean score is classified in good level, but only few of students pass the minimum passing rate of their school.*

**Keywords:** *Study, Ability, Hortatory Exposition Text.*

## **SEBUAH KAJIAN TENTANG KEMAMPUAN SISWA KELAS 2 MAN 2 MODEL PEKANBARU DALAM MEMAHAMI TEKS HORTATORI**

Muthia Abrar, Eliwarti, Fakhri Ras.

muthia.abrar@gmail.com, elieliwarti@gmail.com, fakhriaras@yahoo.com. Contact: +6285264692766

Mahasiswa Program Studi Bahasa Inggris  
Jurusan Bahasa dan Seni  
Fakultas Pelatihan Guru dan Pendidikan  
Universitas Riau

**Abstrak:** Penelitian deskriptif ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui kemampuan siswa kelas 2 MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru dalam memahami teks hortatory eksposisi. Populasi penelitian ini adalah siswa tahun kedua MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru pada tahun ajaran 2016/2017. Jumlah sampel penelitiannya adalah 50 siswa yang terpilih dengan menggunakan teknik sampel acak. Data diperoleh dari tes memahami teks hortatory eksposisi dalam bentuk pilihan ganda dengan memberikan 5 teks hortatory eksposisi dengan 40 soal pilihan ganda. Hasil analisis data menunjukkan bahwa nilai rata-rata kemampuan siswa dalam memahami teks hortatory eksposisi adalah 65.55. Ini dapat disimpulkan bahwa kemampuan siswa tahun kedua MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru dikategorikan bagus. Berdasarkan hasil dari kemampuan siswa dalam setiap komponen pemahaman bacaan, komponen yang paling rendah bagi siswa yaitu menemukan arti kata-kata tertentu (54.8), dan yang paling tinggi yaitu menemukan informasi faktual (82). Hasil dari penelitian ini diharapkan siswa untuk lebih meningkatkan pembelajaran mengenai pemahan teks hortatory eksposisi. Meskipun nilai rata-rata diklasifikasikan bagus, tetapi hanya sedikit siswa yang melewati kriteria standar minimum disekolahnya.

**Kata kunci:** Penelitian, Kemampuan, Teks Hortatory Eksposisi.

## INTRODUCTION

Everybody knows that language is an important part in human life. People use language for communication. They can communicate easily through the language they use. According to Algeo (2010), a language is a system of conventional vocal signs by means of which human beings communicate. He later adds that language is also defined as communication which always happens in social context. People need language to communicate each other. By using language, people can express their ideas and feeling.

According to Crystal (2003), English is the global language and has become one of international languages. This language is used all over the world. As a result, Indonesian government has decided that English must be taught as foreign language in Indonesia. It is the foreign language that is taught as a compulsory subject in junior high school, senior high school and university in Indonesia.

In language learning, especially English, there are four skills that should be learned by students, which are listening, speaking, reading and writing. These four skills should be involved by a teacher in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. The reading skill has to be learned and is considered as one of the important skills for students who are studying languages because it can influence other language skills such as listening, speaking, and writing. Good reading skill, especially in a phonics reading program, will improve spelling (Glen and Davis 2006). Reading also improves a students' vocabulary, leading to more highly-developed language skills and improves the students' ability to write well. It is due to the fact that students learn new words and unconsciously absorb information as they read about things like how to structure sentences and how to use words and language effectively.

Burnes and Page (1991) states that reading comprehension is a reading-thinking activity and as such relies for its success upon the level or intelligence of the reader, the speech of thinking an ability to detail relationship. Reading comprehension means that the students fully understand the specific meaning or purpose of the text.

Since hortatory exposition is one of the genres that should be learned by the second year students of senior high school, the students have to be able to comprehend this kind of text. The purpose of teaching students in comprehending hortatory exposition text is to enable them to learn the generic structure and language features. Besides, it also helps students to comprehend its content. In other words, by learning the text, the students will learn how to find out the ideas of the text and how the text is structured.

The research question of this research was as in the following: how good is the ability of the second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in comprehending hortatory exposition text?

## METHODOLOGY

The type of the research was descriptive research. According to Gay (2000) descriptive research involves collecting data to answer question concerning the current status of the subject of the study. This research was designed to analyze the ability of the second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in comprehending hortatory exposition text.

In collecting the data, the writer gave a written test to the students. In this test, multiple choice type was used. The test consisted of 40 items which came from 8 factors (finding main ideas, finding factual information, finding meaning of certain words, finding references, finding restatements, identifying generic structure, identifying language features and identifying social function). Each factor has 5 questions. The students were asked to choose the correct answer for each question. The text was taken from English textbooks and internet. The population of this research were Science classes and Social classes of second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in academic year 2016-2017. The total number of the second year students from 11 classes were 282 students.

**Table 1 The Population of the Research**

| No                      | Class    | The number of the students           |
|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|
| 1                       | XI IPA 1 | 27                                   |
| 2                       | XI IPA 2 | 26                                   |
| 3                       | XI IPA 3 | 26                                   |
| 4                       | XI IPA 4 | 25                                   |
| 5                       | XI IPA 5 | 26                                   |
| 6                       | XI IPA 6 | 25                                   |
| 7                       | XI IPA 7 | 26                                   |
| 8                       | XI IPA 8 | 25                                   |
| 9                       | XI IPS 1 | 26                                   |
| 10                      | XI IPS 2 | 25                                   |
| 11                      | XI IPS 3 | 25                                   |
| <b>Total Class = 11</b> |          | <b>Total students = 282 students</b> |

The sample is taken by using random sampling as big as 15% out of the population due to the homogeneous character of the population (Gay 2000). The classification of students' scores by Harris (1974) was used to classify the students' scores in comprehending the text. Their classification can be seen in the following table.

**Table 2 The Classification of Students' Scores**

| No | Test Score | Reading Comprehension Level |
|----|------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. | 81-100     | Excellent                   |
| 2. | 61-80      | Good                        |
| 3. | 41-60      | Average                     |
| 4. | 21-40      | Poor                        |

(Harris, 1974)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The collected data of the research were analyzed to find out the ability of the second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in comprehending hortatory exposition text. The description of the students' scores and their level of ability were presented in the table 3.

**Table 3 Students' Individual Scores in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Text**

| Students | Correct Answer | Score | Level     | Percentage |
|----------|----------------|-------|-----------|------------|
| 1        | 35             | 87.5  | Excellent | 14%        |
| 2        | 34             | 85    | Excellent |            |
| 3        | 34             | 85    | Excellent |            |
| 4        | 33             | 82.5  | Excellent |            |
| 5        | 33             | 82.5  | Excellent |            |
| 6        | 33             | 82.5  | Excellent |            |
| 7        | 33             | 82.5  | Excellent |            |
| 8        | 30             | 75    | Good      | 66%        |
| 9        | 30             | 75    | Good      |            |
| 10       | 29             | 72.5  | Good      |            |
| 11       | 29             | 72.5  | Good      |            |
| 12       | 29             | 72.5  | Good      |            |
| 13       | 29             | 72.5  | Good      |            |
| 14       | 28             | 70    | Good      |            |
| 15       | 28             | 70    | Good      |            |
| 16       | 28             | 70    | Good      |            |
| 17       | 27             | 67.5  | Good      |            |
| 18       | 27             | 67.5  | Good      |            |
| 19       | 27             | 67.5  | Good      |            |
| 20       | 27             | 67.5  | Good      |            |
| 21       | 27             | 67.5  | Good      |            |
| 22       | 27             | 67.5  | Good      |            |
| 23       | 27             | 67.5  | Good      |            |
| 24       | 26             | 65    | Good      |            |
| 25       | 26             | 65    | Good      |            |
| 26       | 26             | 65    | Good      |            |
| 27       | 26             | 65    | Good      |            |
| 28       | 26             | 65    | Good      |            |
| 29       | 26             | 65    | Good      |            |
| 30       | 25             | 62.5  | Good      |            |
| 31       | 25             | 62.5  | Good      |            |
| 32       | 25             | 62.5  | Good      |            |
| 33       | 25             | 62.5  | Good      |            |

|       |       |        |         |      |
|-------|-------|--------|---------|------|
| 34    | 24    | 60     | Good    |      |
| 35    | 24    | 60     | Good    |      |
| 36    | 24    | 60     | Good    |      |
| 37    | 24    | 60     | Good    |      |
| 38    | 24    | 60     | Good    |      |
| 39    | 24    | 60     | Good    |      |
| 40    | 24    | 60     | Good    |      |
| 41    | 23    | 57.5   | Average | 14%  |
| 42    | 23    | 57.5   | Average |      |
| 43    | 21    | 52.5   | Average |      |
| 44    | 20    | 50     | Average |      |
| 45    | 20    | 50     | Average |      |
| 46    | 20    | 50     | Average |      |
| 47    | 20    | 50     | Average |      |
| 48    | 19    | 47.5   | Poor    | 6%   |
| 49    | 19    | 47.5   | Poor    |      |
| 50    | 18    | 45     | Poor    |      |
| Total | 1311  | 3277.5 | Good    | 100% |
| Mean  | 26.22 | 65.55  |         |      |

The formula used to calculate the students' individual scores was by dividing the correct answers with the total number of the items and then multiplied by 100. The result shows that 7 students (14%) are in excellent level, 24 students (48%) are in good level, 11 students (22%) are in average level and 8 students (16%) are in poor level. The mean score of the students in comprehending hortatory exposition text is 65.55. From the result, it can be concluded that the ability of the second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru in comprehending hortatory exposition text is in good level (Heaton 1975). It means that most of the students are classified in good level.

**Table 4 The Classification of Students' Mean in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Text**

| No | The Classification of the Questions | Mean Score | Level of Ability |
|----|-------------------------------------|------------|------------------|
| 1  | Finding main ideas                  | 67.2       | Good             |
| 2  | Finding factual information         | 82         | Excellent        |
| 3  | Finding meaning of certain words    | 54.8       | Average          |
| 4  | Finding references                  | 67.2       | Good             |
| 5  | Finding restatements                | 57.2       | Average          |
| 6  | Identifying generic structures      | 62.8       | Good             |
| 7  | Identifying language features       | 63.2       | Good             |
| 8  | Identifying social functions        | 70         | Good             |
|    | Total                               | 65.56      | Good             |

Table 4 shows that among 8 components of reading comprehension, there was only 1 group of question categorized as excellent. The rest of them belong to good and average.

## Discussions

In reading comprehension test, the mean score of the second year students' ability of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru is 65.55 and was analyzed using Heaton (1975) formula. Furthermore, based on the research finding in reading comprehension, there are 7 students are in excellent level. It means that they are able to comprehend the text very well. There are 24 students are in good level, indicating that they have good ability in reading comprehension. Furthermore, there are 11 students are in average level and 8 students are in poor level. It means that the students should practice more in reading comprehension in order to pass the minimum passing rate of English.

It is also found out from the components of reading comprehension, finding factual information aspect is the easiest aspect for the students to comprehend as the highest score on the test with the mean score of 82. On the other hand, finding meaning of certain words aspect with the mean score of 54.8 is the most difficult aspect to comprehend by the students, due to the lowest frequency of use of such word in textbook. It happened because in finding factual information, the answer was already in the text. While in finding meaning of vocabulary, the students have to know the meaning of a word first and then choose the word that has a similar meaning among the options. In short, it can be restated that the students' ability in finding meaning of certain words really depends on students' mastery of vocabulary. In other word, they got the lowest score because the students had limited vocabulary items. In reading, students' vocabulary mastery affects their ability in comprehending and understanding the writers' message through the writers' writing (Thinker 1975). Successful comprehension involves the reader who can discover the meaning. If the students do not master the vocabulary well, they will find it hard to understand and comprehend the text. Therefore, the students have to enhance their vocabulary in order to get good scores in finding meaning of certain words. Based on the previous discussion, the second year students of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru can be categorized into good level in comprehending hortatory exposition text. However, the students need to learn more in comprehending the text. In term of achieving the minimum passing rate, only a few students were able to obtain such criteria due to the high score of the passing rate itself.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

Based on the research finding, there are 7 students who are categorized into excellent level. It means that they are able to comprehend the text very well. There are 24 students who are categorized into good level, indicating that they have good ability in reading comprehension. Furthermore, there are 11 students categorized into average level and 8 students categorized into poor level. It means that the students should learn more about reading comprehension to pass the minimum passing rate in their school.

From the 8 aspects that are considered as the indicators, the highest mean score is in terms of finding factual information (82) and the lowest mean score is in terms of finding meaning of certain words (54.8). As a whole, the students' ability in

comprehending hortatory exposition text can be categorized into good level with the mean score is as big as 65.5.

### **Recommendations**

From the above conclusions, it would be better to recommend the following parties such as students, English teachers and next researchers. First of all, the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition text is categorized into good level, however, some of the scores have yet to reach the minimum passing rate in their school. Therefore the students still need to learn and practice more about hortatory exposition text. For English teachers of MAN 2 Model Pekanbaru, the English teachers should put more efforts to develop the students' knowledge of the language and practice the hortatory exposition text in order to make the students familiar with the reading materials containing the eight indicators. Finally, it is urgent to recommend the next researchers to conduct a further research on the hortatory exposition text.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Algeo, John. (2010). *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Sixth Edition. Wadsworth, Boston: Cengage Learning Academic.
- Burnes and Page.1991. *Insight and Strategies for Teaching Reading*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Group.
- Crystal, David. (2003). *English as a Global Language. Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gay, L.R. (2000). *Educational Research 6th edition*. Upper Saddle River, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Glen, Davis (2006). *The Importance of Reading*. <http://www.learn-to-read-prince-george.com/why-is-reading-important.html>.
- Harris, David. (1974). *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: Mc. Graw. Hill Book Company.
- Heaton, J.B. (1975). *A Practical Guide for Teachers of English as a Second or Foreign Language*. London: Longman.
- Thinker, A. Miles and Cullogh, M.Mc Cinstance. (1975). *Teaching Elementary Reading*. New Jersey: Practice Hall, Inc.